Paul of Samosata, Zenobia and Aurelian: The Church, Local Culture and Political Allegiance in Third-Century Syria
Author(s): Fergus Millar
Source: *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 61 (1971), pp. 1-17
Published by: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/300003
Accessed: 05-02-2024 02:42 +00:00

REFERENCES
Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:
https://www.jstor.org/stable/300003?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents
You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Roman Studies*

PAUL OF SAMOSATA, ZENOBIA AND AURELIAN: THE CHURCH, LOCAL CULTURE AND POLITICAL ALLEGIANCE IN THIRD-CENTURY SYRIA *

By FERGUS MILLAR

1. INTRODUCTION

What we call the ' Eastern frontier ' of the Roman Empire was a thing of shadows, which reflected the diplomatic convenience of a given moment, and dictated the positioning of some soldiers and customs officials, but hardly affected the attitudes or the movements of the people on either side.[1] Nothing more than the raids of desert nomads,[2] for instance, hindered the endless movement of persons and ideas between Judaea and the Babylonian Jewish community.[3] Similarly, as Lucian testifies, offerings came to the temple of Atargatis at Hierapolis-Bambyce from a wide area of the Near and Middle East, including Babylonia.[4] The actual movement to and fro of individuals was reflected, as we have recently been reminded,[5] in a close interrelation of artistic and architectural styles. Moreover, whatever qualifications have to be made in regard to specific places, it is incontestable that Semitic languages, primarily Aramaic in its various dialects, remained in active use, in a varying relationship to Greek, from the Tigris through the Fertile Crescent to the Phoenician coast. This region remained, we must now realize, a cultural unity, substantially unaffected by the empires of Rome or of Parthia or Sassanid Persia.[6]

On the face of it, these facts might seem to give added confirmation to what is now the standard interpretation of the career of Paul of Samosata. The bare structure of this career, which we know essentially from Eusebius,[7] is that he succeeded Demetrianus as bishop of Antioch, was accused of heresy, and was the subject of two synods held at Antioch in about 264 and 268/9 (for the dates see below), the second of which condemned him. On his refusal to leave the church house, his opponents made a successful petition against him to Aurelian (270–5). The accepted interpretation, represented primarily by G. Bardy's book on Paul,[8] and by Glanville Downey's standard work on the history of Antioch,[9] sets this career firmly in the context of a wide pattern of cultural and political relationships. On this view, Paul, coming from Samosata, was the champion of the ' native ' (Syriac- or Aramaic-speaking) element in the Antiochene church. His opponents were the representatives of Greek culture. Moreover, a remark made in the letter of the second synod retailing Paul's offences is held to mean that he held a government post as *ducenarius*; and later evidence is brought in to show that this will have been in the service of Palmyra, more specifically of its queen, Zenobia. Thus a conflict of cultures becomes intimately linked to a political conflict. Paul owes his position to Zenobia, and his opponents' appeal to Aurelian

* I am very grateful, for discussion and correction, to Professor A. D. Momigliano, Professor G. D. Kilpatrick, Mr. P. R. L. Brown, Mr. P. J. Parsons, Dr. J. Rea, Dr. T. D. Barnes, and especially to M. Henri Seyrig.

[1] See Philostratus, *vit. Ap. Ty.* I, 20 for Apollonius' famous confrontation with the customs official at Zeugma. The only evidence known to me of the frontier actually preventing movement comes in Jerome, *Vita Malchi* 3 (*PL* XXIII, 54) where Malchus, from Nisibis, relates that (sometime in the first half of the fourth century) ' quia ad Orientem ire non poteram, propter vicinam Persidem, et Romanorum militum custodiam, ad Occidentem verti pedes . . .'

[2] Note Herod's establishment of a colony of Babylonian Jews in Batanea for the protection of caravans of pilgrims coming from Babylonia to Jerusalem. Jos., *Ant.* XVII, 2, 1–3 (23–31); *Vita* 54–61.

[3] For visitors from Mesopotamia see J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (1969), 66–7, and for the cultural and personal relations of the two communities the successive volumes by J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia:* I, *The Parthian Period*[2] (1969); II, *The Early Sasanian Period* (1966); III, *From Shapur I to Shapur II* (1968); IV, *The Age of Shapur II* (1969); V, *Later Sasanian Times* (1970).

[4] Lucian, *de dea Syra* 13, 32. See below (p. 5).

[5] J. B. Ward-Perkins, ' The Roman West and the Parthian East ', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* LI (1965), 175; ' Frontiere politiche e frontiere culturali ', *La Persia e il mondo greco-romano*, Acc. Naz. dei Lincei, anno 363, quad. 7 (1966), 395.

[6] See the remarks by P. Brown, ' The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire ', *JRS* LIX (1969), 92.

[7] Eusebius, *HE* VII, 27–30.

[8] G. Bardy, *Paul de Samosate : étude historique*[2], Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense IV (1929); note, however, the more cautious view of Paul in Bardy, *La question des langues dans l'église ancienne* (1948), 19.

[9] G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (1961), 263–4, 310–15.

will have taken place when the latter recaptured Antioch from the Palmyrenes in 272. In spite of the partial reservations in the excellent earlier study of Paul by F. Loofs [10] and the briefly expressed scepticism of A. Alföldi,[11] this interpretation seems to have become firmly established.[12] It also serves what appears to be the necessary function of explaining how the synod of Antioch could have petitioned a pagan Emperor, and how that Emperor found it worthwhile to attend to their request, and to give it a favourable response.

The career of Paul of Samosata is thus central to a number of questions of great delicacy and importance. The collection and arrangement of the scanty and disparate evidence for the various elements of a possible 'local' culture in any area of the Roman Empire is difficult enough; much more sensitive is the question of the role, function or prestige of that culture in relation to a dominant culture.[13] It is a still more hazardous step to assert that what we know of any individual episode justifies the imposition of an explanation in terms of a local 'nationalism'.[14] But at the same time the very fragility and scantiness of our evidence is itself a reason for not proceeding with brusque confidence to negative conclusions.

2. SYRIAC AND GREEK IN THE EAST SYRIAN REGIONS AND MESOPOTAMIA

From scattered evidence we can now gain some conception of the geographical spread and profound influence of Greek culture through Mesopotamia to Iran, Central Asia and Afghanistan.[15] By contrast, we have from Judaea the example of a society close to the Mediterranean seaboard, whose culture was very early deeply affected by Hellenism,[16] and where the speaking of Greek was clearly widespread,[17] but which consciously maintained and developed a local culture and tradition within its Hellenized environment. We could hardly ask for a neater example of the conflict of cultures than the story of R. Gamaliel II elaborately justifying his use of the baths at Acco-Ptolemais, in spite of the presence there of a statue of Aphrodite.[18]

Moreover, we have at least one case where a change of political regime does seem to be immediately reflected in the predominance of Greek as an official language. In both language and art the kingdom of Nabataea, annexed in 106,[19] belonged to the Aramaic-Greek world mentioned above. But while the Nabataean language, as is shown by inscriptions,[20] persisted at least until the early fourth century, the 'archive of Babatha', discovered in 1961 and still awaiting full publication, shows that to a significant extent Nabataean was

[10] F. Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata; eine Untersuchung zur altchristlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte, Texte und Untersuchungen* XLIV, 5 (1924), esp. 34.

[11] *CAH* XII, 178, n. 1. 'The political connections of Zenobia with Bishop Paul of Antioch seem to the present writer even less real than to Fr. Loofs.' For the relevance of Alföldi's classic studies of the coinage in this period, see below (pp. 8–9).

[12] See for example, E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I (1930), 94; J. Lebreton, J. Zeiller, *Histoire de l'Église* II (1935), 345; H. Grégoire, *Les persécutions dans l'Empire romain* [2] (1964), 57; J. Daniélou, H. Marrou, *Nouvelle histoire de l'Église* I: *des origines à Saint Grégoire le Grand* (1963), 247; W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution* (1965), 443–4; B. Altaner, A. Stuiber, *Patrologie* [7] (1966), 214; H. Chadwick, *The Early Church* (1967), 114–5.

[13] For the parallel case of North Africa, see the contrasted treatments by F. Millar, 'Local Cultures in the Roman Empire: Libyan, Punic and Latin in Roman Africa', *JRS* LVIII (1968), 126, and P. Brown, 'Christianity and Local Culture in Late Roman Africa', ibid. 85.

[14] For a cautious and useful survey of this question in another region see R. MacMullen, 'Nationalism in Roman Egypt', *Aegyptus* XLIV (1964), 179.

[15] See the brilliant survey by E. Bickerman, 'The Seleucids and the Achaemenids', *Persia e il mondo greco-romano* (see n. 5), 87; see now P. Bernard, 'Aï Khanum on the Oxus: A Hellenistic City in Central Asia,' *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, LIII (1967), 71; L. Robert, 'De Delphes à l'Oxus. Inscriptions grecques nouvelles de la Bactriane', *CRAI* 1968, 416; and in general D. Schlumberger, *L'Orient hellénisé* (1970).

[16] See now M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh. v. Chr.* (1969).

[17] The evidence, from a variety of periods, is collected by J. N. Sevenster, *Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known?* (1968).

[18] Mishnah, *Abodah Zarah*, 3, 4 (ed. Danby, p. 440). On the more permissive attitude to representational art which developed in the second and third centuries see, e.g., C. H. Kraeling, *The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report*, VIII, 1: *The Synagogue* (1956), 340–6; E. E. Urbach, 'The Rabbinical Laws of Idolatry in the Second and Third Centuries in the Light of Archaeological and Historical Facts', *IEJ* IX (1959), 149, 229.

[19] See now G. W. Bowersock, 'The Annexation and Initial Garrison of Arabia', *Zeitschr. f. Pap. u. Epig.* V (1970), 37.

[20] See the excellent survey of J. Starcky, 'Pétra et la Nabatène,' *Dict. de la Bible*, Supp. VII (1966), 886–1017, esp. 921.

abandoned in legal documents and replaced by Greek within a few years of the establishment of the province.[21]

Thus the wider background provides an ample justification for posing the question whether the development of Syriac literature, almost entirely Christian, and of the distinctive Syriac script, reflects some wider cultural and political movement, to which both the rise of Palmyra and heretical movements in the Church within Roman Syria might conceivably be related.

All the places which are most relevant—Osrhoene, Palmyra and Samosata—belong to that wide region on either side of the Euphrates over which Roman rule was steadily extended in the course of the first three centuries of the Empire. Beyond this area too, in Parthian and Sassanid Mesopotamia and Iran, it is generally accepted that cultural changes were taking place, with a steady eclipse of Hellenism in the surviving Greek cities in the later Parthian period; [22] though it is notable that, as late as the end of the first century A.D., a Greek geographer could be produced by distant Charax at the head of the Persian Gulf.[23] Nor is it clear that it was mere vainglory that led to Greek being one of the three languages of the great inscription of Shapur I on the Kaaba of Zoraster at Naqsh-i-Rustam.[24]

The rise of Syriac belongs to the 'frontier' area along the Euphrates and to Osrhoene, with its capital Edessa. The Syriac cursive script is first attested on an inscription of A.D. 6 from Birecik on the left bank of the Euphrates, and a couple of other inscriptions come from the same region later in the century.[25] More important is the earliest surviving Syriac document on perishable material, the deed of sale written at Edessa in 243, and found at Dura-Europos.[26] From Edessa we have the apparently eye-witness account of the flood of A.D. 201, later incorporated in the Syriac *Chronicle of Edessa*,[27] and more significantly the writings (all now lost except the *Book of the Laws of Countries*) of the heretic Bardesanes (154–*c.* 220).[28] In the face of this important development we perhaps forget that Edessa too was a Macedonian colony.[29] Bardesanes was literate in both Greek and Syriac,[30] as was his son Harmonius, who was educated in Athens, and composed hymns in Syriac; [31] and Bardesanes' Syriac works were translated into Greek by his disciples.[32] In short, Bardesanes was the product of a mixed culture, where it may be impossible for us to determine what the values attached to each language were, or even, in certain cases, which the original language of a particular work was. Thus, for instance, only the most careful analysis can make it probable that the *Odes of Solomon* were written in Syriac, and translated into Greek by the third century, from when we have a papyrus text in Greek of *Ode* XI.[33]

Edessa may not have been totally different from another Macedonian foundation much better known to us, Dura-Europos. Here, together with a preponderance of Semitic cults, Greek documents still far outnumber all others (in Latin, Pahlavi and Middle Persian, Parthian, Safaitic, Palmyrene, Aramaic and Syriac), even from the latest, Roman, period of the city.[34] Furthermore, one of the Greek documents (*P. Dura* 10) serves to illustrate the

[21] For what has been made known of these documents so far see Y. Yadin in *Israel Exploration Journal* XII (1962), 235–48, and idem, 'The Nabataean Kingdom, Provincia Arabia, Petra and En-Geddi in the Documents from Nahal Hever,' *Jaarb. Ex Oriente Lux* XVII (1963), 227.

[22] For the Greek colonies and cities of Mesopotamia see, e.g., A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*[2] (1971), ch. IX; N. Pigulevskaja, *Les villes de l'état iranien aux époques parthe et sassanide* (1963), esp. ch. I–IV; M. A. R. Colledge, *The Parthians* (1967), 96–7.

[23] For the date of Isidorus of Charax see S. A. Nodelman, 'A Preliminary History of Characene', *Berytus* XIII (1960), 88, on pp. 107–8.

[24] For the text, A. Maricq, 'Res Gestae Divi Shaporis', *Syria* XXXV (1958), 295.

[25] A. Maricq, 'La plus ancienne inscription syriaque; celle de Birecik', *Syria* XXXIX (1962), 88; cf. J. Pirenne, 'Aux origines de la graphie syriaque', *Syria* XL (1963), 101, and E. Jenni, 'Die altsyrischen Inschriften, 1–3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.', *Theol. Zeitschr.* XXI (1965), 371.

[26] *P. Dura* 28, now re-edited by J. A. Goldstein, 'The Syriac Bill of Sale from Dura-Europos', *JNES* XXV (1966), 1.

[27] Ed. L. Hallier, *Texte und Untersuchungen* IX, 1 (1892), see pp. 86–7.

[28] See H. J. W. Drijvers, *Bardaisan of Edessa* (1966).

[29] See now J. B. Segal, *Edessa, 'The Blessed City'* (1970); see pp. 30–1 for traces of Greek culture there in this period.

[30] Epiphanius, *Panarion* 56, 1, 2; cf. Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* 1, 22 (*PG* LXXXIII, 372), mentioning Syriac only.

[31] Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccles.* III, 16, 5–7; Theodoret, *loc cit.* (n. 30).

[32] Euseb., *HE* IV, 30, 1; Jerome, *de vir. ill.* 33.

[33] See J. A. Emerton, 'Some Problems of Text and Language in the Odes of Solomon', *J. Theol. St.* XVIII (1967), 372.

[34] For surveys see C. B. Welles, 'The Population of Roman Dura', *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of A. C. Johnson* (1951), 251; G. D. Kilpatrick, 'Dura-Europos: the Parchments and the Papyri', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* V (1964), 215.

extraordinary tangle of confusions which tends to beset any attempt to portray the cultural framework of early Eastern Christianity. This is the Greek fragment of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian; in spite of the obvious implications of the name, and the fact that no source actually says so, it has frequently been argued that this was originally composed in Syriac. In fact there are no valid linguistic arguments against the *prima facie* deduction from this very early text that Greek was the original language.[35] But what was the origin of Tatian himself? In his *Address to the Greeks*, itself written in Greek, he says (claiming for Christianity the prevailing prestige of Oriental wisdom,[36] but also neatly exhibiting the prevailing confusion of cultures) ταῦθ' ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, ὁ κατὰ βαρβάρους φιλοσοφῶν Τατιανὸς συνέταξα, γεννηθεὶς μὲν ἐν τῇ Ἀσσυρίων γῇ, παιδευθεὶς δὲ πρῶτον μὲν τὰ ὑμέτερα . . .[37] 'Assyria', it has been asserted,[38] must refer to the land east of the Tigris. But the word could be applied to southern Mesopotamia,[39] and is even used, by a literary conceit, of places within Roman Syria. Lucian, from Samosata, calls himself an 'Assyrian' (see below), while Philostratus seems to apply it to the inhabitants of Antioch [40]—and equally to a man from Nineveh.[41] Clement, a near contemporary, calls Tatian simply, 'the Syrian'.[42] Of all our sources only the not always reliable Epiphanius says anything definite about his origins; after saying separately that he was ἀπὸ Ἑλλήνων ὁρμώμενος and that he was (again) a 'Syrian', he records that his preaching began in Mesopotamia and continued, after a visit to Rome, in the area of Antioch, Pisidia and Cilicia.[43] We cannot in fact state the origin of Tatian, any more than we can of the 'Assyrian' Prepon, who, according to the contemporary Hippolytus, wrote against Bardesanes (whom he calls an 'Armenian' [44]—while Porphyry, later in the century, calls him a 'Babylonian' [45]). But the very fact that clear definitions of locality and nationality are wanting has its own significance.

All that has been said applied equally to Paul's native city, Samosata. Most of what we know of it relates to the royal house finally deposed by Vespasian about A.D. 72, with its mixed Iranian and Greek traditions, and the vast inscriptions in Greek relating to the royal cult, from the *hierothesion* of Mithridates Callinicus at Arsameia on the Nymphaios and of Antiochus I on Nemrud Dagh, with its magnificent free-standing sculptures.[46] We would expect that here, as in the other border regions absorbed by Rome, Greek and a dialect of Aramaic persisted together. This is tentatively confirmed by the evidence of Lucian (who in different passages calls himself both an 'Assyrian' and a 'Syrian' [47]) when in the *Bis Accusatus* 27 he makes 'Rhetoric', in the role of his accuser, call him as a youth βάρβαρον ἔτι τὴν φωνὴν καὶ μονονουχὶ κάνδυν ἐνδεδυκότα ἐς τὸν Ἀσσύριον τρόπον. This could easily be dismissed as a depiction of standard rhetorical exaggeration, referring at most to a local accent or a mere rusticity. But we have just enough evidence to show that such a conclusion would be over-hasty. For what may be the earliest product of Syriac literature, the letter of Mara bar Sarapion,[48] is the work of a Samosatene writing to his son in the period after the expulsion of some citizens from there (including the writer) by the Romans; the occasion cannot be definitely determined, and might be any moment from the capture in 72 to the third century. Moreover we have an apparently genuine martyr-act from Samosata, written in Syriac and relating to the early fourth century.[49]

From the mere fact that Paul is described as a Samosatene we cannot simply assume that

[35] See Kilpatrick, o.c. (n. 34), 222–4.

[36] Compare A. J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* I (1944), ch. II, 'Les prophètes de l'Orient'.

[37] Λόγος πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας 42. Ed. E. Schwartz *Texte und Untersuchungen* IV, 1 (1888).

[38] e.g. A. Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament: Manuscript Studies* (1954), 1; P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* [2] (1959), 283–4.

[39] See A. Maricq, 'La province d'Assyrie créée par Trajan', *Syria* XXXVI (1959), 254; cf. P. Brown, op. cit. (n. 6), 93.

[40] Philos, *Vit. Ap. Ty.* I, 16 ἐπεφοίτησε καὶ Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ . . . καὶ παρῆλθεν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Δαφναίου Ἀπόλλωνος, ᾧ περιάπτουσιν Ἀσσύριοι τὸν μῦθον τὸν Ἀρκάδα.

[41] Ibid. I, 19.

[42] *Strom.* III, 12/81, 1; see also Theodoret, *Haer. fab. comp.* I, 20 (*PG* LXXXIII, 369).

[43] *Panarion* 46, 1.

[44] Hippolytus, *Elenchus* VII, 31, 1–2.

[45] Porphyry, *de abstinentia* IV, 17.

[46] See F. K. Dörner and R. Neumann *Forschungen in Kommagene* (1939); F. K. Dörner, and T. Goell, *Arsameia am Nymphaios: die Ausgrabungen im Hierothesion des Mithridates Kallinikos von 1955–1956* (1963). Cf. F. K. Dörner, *Kommagene, ein wiederentdecktes Königreich* [2] (1967).

[47] *De dea Syra* 1 γράφω δὲ Ἀσσύριος ἐών. *Scyth.* 9 τοὺς Σύρους ἡμᾶς.

[48] Text and English translation (p. 70–6) by W. Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum* (1855). Cf. F. Schulthess, 'Der Brief des Mara bar Sarapion', *ZDMG* LI (1897), 365; R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque* [2] (1900), 248—50; A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (1922), 10.

[49] See Duval, op. cit. (n. 48), 129.

he was born and brought up there.[50] But if we grant that it is probable that he had some substantial connection with the place, then it is not unlikely that he spoke Syriac as well as Greek (for there can be no possible doubt that he used Greek as bishop of Antioch). But, even so, the speaking or writing of Syriac did not of itself represent a rival, 'Oriental', culture. Just as early Syriac documents and literary works exhibit numerous Greek loan-words,[51] so for instance the letter of Mara bar Sarapion itself has a Stoic colouring and is replete with allusions from the history of classical Greece.[52]

Moreover, the same doubts which must be felt about the 'orientalism' of Paul apply to Palmyra itself. For while no one can question either the total predominance of Semitic cults there or the vigour and splendour of the native Palmyrene art and architecture, the city (now a Roman *colonia*) was officially bilingual in Palmyrene and Greek[53] (though Palmyrene nomenclature in particular suggests that the population was in fact largely of Arab stock[54]). But it is only the *Historia Augusta* which appears to imply that Zenobia could not write a letter in Greek.[55] That point arises in connection with one of the only two facts we can be said to know about the culture and historical outlook of Zenobia. The first is that she brought to her court Longinus, the foremost Greek literary scholar of his day.[56] The second is that in Egypt she identified herself with Cleopatra; so it was to her under this name that a Greek rhetor, Callinicus of Petra, dedicated his history of Alexandria.[57]

Thus the wider cultural background of the third-century Near East is fraught with ambiguities. Before coming to the events of the 260's and 270's it remains to look at Roman Syria proper. Is there anything to suggest either the survival of non-classical traditions or the development of a local strain in Syrian Christianity?

3. LOCAL CULTURE IN ROMAN SYRIA

Abundant evidence illustrates the survival of pre-Hellenic cult-centres in Roman Syria and its environs. One need only mention by way of example the cult of Perasia at Hierapolis-Castabala[58] (in the province of Cilicia), of Atargatis at Hierapolis-Bambyce, brilliantly described by Lucian in the *De dea Syra*,[59] or of Elagabal at Emesa.[60] Equally clear is the continuous tradition of the cults of cities on the Phoenician coastline from the second millennium B.C. into the Roman period. It is particularly significant that this was a conscious survival. For in the first half of the second century A.D. Philon of Byblos claimed to have composed his *Phoenicica* on the basis of a work in Phoenician (a language related to Aramaic and Hebrew) by one Sanchuniathon, who dated from before the Trojan wars—and who in fact perhaps belonged in the Persian or early Hellenistic period, and may have written in a dialect of Aramaic.[61] Philon's work is important both in showing that an educated Greek

[50] Compare the remarks of R. Syme, 'Hadrian and Italica,' *JRS* LIV (1964), 142.

[51] See A. Schall, *Studien über griechische Fremdwörter im Syrischen* (1960), 27–128.

[52] The writer uses, in the course of providing *exempla*, the names of Polycrates, Achilles, Agamemnon, Priam, Archimedes, Socrates, Pythagoras, Palamedes and Plato.

[53] For a survey, see J. Starcky, *Palmyre* (1952); cf. also le Comte du Mesnil du Buisson, *Les Tessères et les monnaies de Palmyre : un art, une culture et une philosophie grecs dans les moules d'une cité et d'une religion sémitiques* (1962).

[54] See A. Caquot, 'Sur l'onomastique religieuse de Palmyre,' *Syria* XXXIX (1962), 231; cf. H. Seyrig in *Syria* XLVII (1970), 87–92.

[55] *HA Aurel.* 30, 3, 'grave inter eos qui caesi sunt de Longino philosopho fuisse perhibetur, quo illa magistro usa esse ad Graecas litteras dicitur, quem quidem Aurelianus idcirco dicitur occidisse, quod superbior illa epistula ipsius diceretur dictata consilio, quamvis Syro esset sermone contexta.'

[56] *HA* ibid.; Zosimus I, 56, 2–3; Photius, *Bib.* 265, p. 492 Bekker (see below, p. 13); *Syncellus* I, p. 721 Bonn. For the text of a letter from Longinus written to Porphyry in Sicily (so between *c.* 267, Porph., *vit. Plot.* 6, and 272) inviting him to join him in 'Phoenicia', see Porph., *vit. Plot.* 19. Libanius, *Ep.* 1078 Förster (998 Wolf) mentions a λόγος ''Οδαίναθος' of Longinus, presumably a funeral address. Cf. *RE* s.v. 'Longinus'.

[57] See A. Stein, 'Kallinikos von Petrai', *Hermes* LVIII (1923), 448; J. Schwartz, 'Les Palmyréniens en Égypte', *Bull. Soc. Ant. Alex.* XL (1953), 63; A. D. E. Cameron in *CQ* N.S. XVII (1967), 382–3.

[58] See A. Dupont-Sommer and L. Robert, *La déesse de Hiérapolis-Castabala, Cilicie* (1964), relating a fourth-century B.C. Aramaic inscription to documents of the classical period.

[59] See H. Stocks, 'Studien zu Lukians 'de Syria dea',' *Berytus* IV (1937), 1; G. Goossens, *Hiérapolis de Syrie : essai de monographie historique* (1943).

[60] For the essential see *RAC* s.v. 'Elagabal'.

[61] For the *Phoenicica* of Philon of Byblos see Jacoby *FGrH* 790 F. 1–7; on Sanchuniathon see *RE* s.v. 'Sanchuniathon' and M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (1966), 24–8; cf. e.g. O. Eissfeldt, 'Art und Aufbau der phönizischen Geschichte des Philo von Byblos', *Syria* XXXIII (1956), 88 = *Kleine Schriften* III (1966), 398. Note now especially, on both the survival of Phoenician gods and the work of Philo, le Comte du Mesnil du Buisson, *Études sur les dieux phéniciens hérités par l'Empire romain* (1970).

could be explicitly conscious of the non-Hellenic traditions of his homeland, and in filling out the very scanty documentary record of Phoenician from this period. The record indeed hardly extends beyond the Hellenistic age: we have for instance a Phoenician inscription from Oumm El-'Amed dated to 132 B.C.,[62] and another from Byblos which may be from the early Roman period, perhaps as late as the first century A.D.[63] More securely dated, to 96 B.C., is the latest of a series of bilingual Sidonian inscriptions from Athens and the Peiraeus.[64] About 100 B.C. Meleager, in an epigram recording his birth at Gadara, move to Tyre and old age in Cos, neatly contrasts the form of greeting in Aramaic, Phoenician and Greek.[65] In the third century we may note that Porphyry of Tyre gained this name, by which he is always known, from a word-play by Longinus (whose mother came from Emesa [66]) on his original name, 'Malchus'.[67] Earlier, as Porphyry himself explains, his friends had been accustomed to nickname him simply 'Basileus'.[68] It is clear at least that Porphyry and his friends knew that in his πάτριος διάλεκτος *malech* meant 'King'. Whether he had a real knowledge of Phoenician (or Aramaic), and whether his studies of the Old Testament involved any knowledge of Hebrew, remains obscure.[69]

Further north on the Phoenician coastline, from the cities around Aradus and up to Gabala, we may note the presence of Semitic lettering on coins of the Hellenistic period,[70] the bilingual inscription of a man from Aradus who died at Demetrias in Thessaly about 200 B.C.,[71] and also a bilingual inscription (*IGLS* 4001) from Aradus itself, dating to 25/4 B.C. But thereafter there is a gap of centuries before we learn from Socrates that Severianus, bishop of Gabala in the early fifth century, though supposedly educated, spoke Greek with difficulty and in a definite Syrian accent.[72]

The best confirmation, however, of the possibility that Philon of Byblos might have known Phoenician or Aramaic comes from a remarkable source, a scholion found in one of the manuscripts of Photius' account of Iamblichus, the Greek novelist of the second century A.D. The information is represented as coming from Iamblichus himself, and has certainly every appearance of being circumstantial. According to the passage, Iamblichus recorded that he was a Syrian on both his mother's and his father's side—'not one of the Greeks inhabiting Syria, but one of the natives, speaking their language and living by their customs'. He acquired his knowledge of Babylonian lore from a captive taken in Trajan's Parthian campaign; later he was trained in Greek and became a skilled *rhetor*.[73]

This is the only item of evidence from a pagan source which clearly implies the existence of a whole class of educated Aramaic-speaking persons in Roman Syria, and as such is of great importance. For further evidence on the use of Aramaic in Syria we have to wait until the Christian period, whose literature, as always, allows us insight into social levels which pagan literature tended systematically to ignore.[74] Though Christian writers call the native language of Syria 'Syrian' it was actually what we call Aramaic, and it will save confusion to reserve 'Syriac' for the dialect of Edessa, the script associated with it, and the literary language developed from it. In assembling the evidence it will not be necessary to pay special attention to those passages where Christian writers merely refer generally to

[62] M. Dunand, R. Duru, *Oumm El-'Amed, une ville de l'époque hellénistique aux échelles de Tyre* (1962), 181, no. 1 = H. Donner, W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* [2] I–III (1966–9), no. 18.

[63] Donner and Röllig, op. cit. no. 12. Compare, however, J. Brian Peckham, *The Development of the Late Phoenician Scripts* (1968), 54.

[64] See Peckham, op. cit. 78.

[65] *Anth. Pal.* VII, 419, ll. 5–8; A. S. F. Gow, D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* I (1965), 217, ὃν θεόπαις ἤνδρωσε Τύρος Γαδάρων θ' ἱερὰ χθών, /Κῶς δ' ἐρατὴ Μερόπων πρέσβυν ἐγηροτρόφει. /ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν Σύρος ἐσσί, σαλάμ· εἰ δ' οὖν σύ γε Φοῖνιξ, /ναίδιος· εἰ δ' Ελλην, χαῖρε· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ φράσον.

[66] Suda 735.

[67] Eunapius, *Vit. Soph.* p. 456.

[68] Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 17 Βασιλεὺς δὲ τοὔνομα τῷ Πορφυρίῳ ἐμοὶ προσῆν, κατὰ μὲν πάτριον διάλεκτον Μάλκῳ κεκλημένῳ, ὅπερ μοι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὄνομα κέκλητο, τοῦ δὲ Μάλκου ἑρμηνείαν ἔχοντος βασιλεύς, εἴ τις εἰς Ἑλλήνιδα διάλεκτον μεταβάλλειν ἐθέλοι. cf. ibid. 20, 21.

[69] Cf. J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre* (1913), 9–10. I have not, however, found any serious discussion of this question.

[70] H. Seyrig, 'Monnaies hellénistiques', *Rev. Num.* VI (1964), 7, esp. 19–20, 46–7.

[71] O. Masson, 'Recherches sur les Phéniciens dans le monde héllenistique,' *BCH* XLIII (1969), p. 698.

[72] Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* VI, 11, 3, δοκῶν πεπαιδεῦσθαι, οὐ πάνυ τῇ φωνῇ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἐξετράνου γλῶσσαν· ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἑλληνιστὶ φθεγγόμενος Σύρος ἦν τὴν φωνήν.

[73] Photius, *Bib.* 94, (75b), ed. Henry vol. II, p. 40, οὗτος ὁ Ἰάμβλιχος Σύρος ἦν γένος πατρόθεν καὶ μητρόθεν, Σύρος δὲ οὐχὶ τῶν ἐπιφκηκότων τὴν Συρίαν Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλὰ τῶν αὐτοχθόνων, γλῶσσαν δὲ Σύραν εἰδὼς καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνων ἤθεσι ζῶν . . .

[74] For collections of relevant passages in Christian writers see C. Charon, 'L'origine ethnographique des Melkites', *Echos d'Orient* XI (1908), 35, 82; G. Bardy, *La question des langues dans l'église ancienne* (1948), 19–31; A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (1964), 994.

Aramaic or to the meanings of individual words in it; [75] what is important is to examine those items which give some indication of the geographical or social range of Aramaic-speaking, and its role within the Church.

It so happens that much of the relevant evidence relates to the gentile population of Palestine and its environs. The earliest Christian evidence comes from the 'long', Syriac, recension of Eusebius' *Martyrs of Palestine*, and relates to Procopius, a martyr from Scythopolis executed in 303, who had the role of interpreting into Aramaic in the Church there.[76] What is meant by this is revealed by the detailed report of the conduct of services in Aelia (Jerusalem) made a century later by the pilgrim Egeria (or Aetheria). She found that part of the congregation spoke only Greek, part only Aramaic, and part both. But the bishop, even if he knew Aramaic, spoke only Greek in conducting services, while a presbyter had the task of translating his words into Aramaic. Similarly, readings from the Bible were made first in Greek, and then interpreted.[77] Nothing could demonstrate more clearly the values attached to the two languages. One may compare with it the closely related evidence of Jerome, describing the funeral of St. Paula in Bethlehem in 404—' Graeco, Latino, Syroque sermone Psalmi in ordine personabant '.[78]

Towards the middle of the fourth century we find the hermit Hilarion, in the desert outside Gaza, questioning a Frankish *candidatus* of Constantius in Aramaic, and miraculously causing the man to answer likewise; Hilarion then repeated his question in Greek. He was clearly in fact bilingual; he came from a village near Gaza, and in his youth had been to study with a *grammateus* in Alexandria. Aramaic was evidently common, but not universal, in the towns of this area. Retailing an incident when Hilarion visited Elusa, Jerome emphasizes that the place was *semibarbarus*: a large crowd abandoned a festival of Venus which was in progress there and greeted Hilarion with shouts of ' Barech '—' Bless (us) '.[79] In 402 we find in Gaza itself a child, seized by divine possession, calling out in Aramaic instructions for the burning of the temple of Marnas there, and repeating them in Greek when interrogated by the bishop, Porphyry. But, when interrogated herself, his mother swears that neither she nor her son knows Greek.[80]

From Syria proper we do not have so much clear evidence. But Jerome speaks of a hermit named Malchus living in a village 30 miles east of Antioch—' Syrus natione et lingua, ut revera eiusdem loci indigena ' (though in fact he says later that the man was by origin an immigrant from Nisibis).[81] But what of Antioch itself? Theodoret, who was born and educated in Antioch, and was bishop of Cyrrhus in the first half of the fifth century, wrote entirely in Greek but certainly knew Aramaic, and used his knowledge in interpreting the Bible.[82] It is not likely, however, that he learned it in Antioch itself. For the clearest indication of the linguistic situation there comes from John Chrysostom, who in a sermon preached in the city describes the country-people coming in for a Christian festival as a λαὸς κατὰ μὲν τὴν γλῶτταν ἡμῖν ἐνηλλαγμένος, κατὰ δὲ τὴν πίστιν ἡμῖν συμφωνῶν.[83] It seems indisputable that he means that, characteristically at least, the Christians of Antioch spoke Greek and those of its *chora* Aramaic. Similarly, Theodoret mentions a hermit from the *chora* of Cyrrhus who knew no Greek.[84]

Thus, though the evidence is slight and scattered, it is sufficient to show that Aramaic was a living language in Roman Syria. But all the indications are that it remained a rustic

[75] See e.g. Jerome, *Vita Pauli* 6 (*PL* XXIII, 21); *In Esaiam* 9, 29, 1–8 (*CCL* LXXIII, 370); Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* I, 7, 4; III, 24, 1; IV, 10, 1; *Hist. Relig.* 13 (*PG* LXXXII, 1400, 1404).

[76] For the text see B. Violet, *Texte und Untersuchungen* XIV, 4 (1896), pp. 4 and 7; cf. H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques* (1905), 142 f.

[77] *Pereg. Egeriae* 47, 3–4 (*CCL* CLXXV, 89); ed. H. Pétré, *Éthérie, Journal de Voyage, Sources Chrétiennes* 21 (1948), 260–1.

[78] Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 29 (*PL* XXII, 905 = *CSEL* LV, 348).

[79] Jerome, *Vit. Hil.* 2, 22, 23, 25 (*PL* XXIII 29, 39–41).

[80] Marc. Diac., *Vit. Porph.* 66–8, ed. H. Grégoire, M.-A. Kugener (1930).

[81] Jerome, *Vita Malchi* 2–3 (*PL* XXIII, 54).

[82] That he was a native Aramaic speaker would be an improper deduction from the modesty of his own claim to Greek culture in *Graec. affect. curatio* 5 (*PG* LXXXIII, 952). But that he understood spoken Aramaic is clear from the incident in *Hist. Relig.* 21 (*PG* LXXII, 1441); cf. n. 75 (above).

[83] John Chrys., *Hom. 19 ad pop. Ant.* 1 (*PG* XLIX, 188); cf. *Serm. de mart.* 1 (*PG* L, 646) πόλις μὲν γὰρ καὶ χώρα ἐν τοῖς βιωτικοῖς πράγμασιν ἀλλήλων διεστήκασι, κατὰ δὲ τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον κοινωνοῦσι καὶ ἥνωνται. Μὴ γάρ μοι τὴν βάρβαρον αὐτῶν φωνὴν ἴδῃς, ἀλλὰ τὴν φιλοσοφοῦσαν αὐτῶν διανοίαν. On the other hand *Hom. Matt.* 7, 2 (*PG* LVII, 74), καὶ ὅσοι τὴν Σύρων ἴσασι γλῶτταν, ἴσασι τὸ λεγόμενον, seems to imply the presence of some Aramaic speakers in his audience.

[84] Theod., *Hist. Relig.*, 17 (*PG* LXXXII, 1420, 1424

vernacular with no claim to rival Greek as a language of culture; [85] it does not seem to have been until the fifth century that Syriac came to be the vehicle of literature written in Roman Syria.[86] Furthermore, although the appearance of a Christian Syriac literature in Edessa in the second and third centuries is something of great interest and importance, it seems likely that we should see it as an off-shoot of, rather than as a rival to, Christian Greek culture. In short, just as it seems unlikely that either a man from Samosata or a ruler of Palmyra could have seen themselves as in any sense representatives of the 'Orient' as against the Graeco-Roman world, so there is very little to indicate that such a claim would have evoked any response in Roman Syria. More particularly, the most we could claim, from parallel and later evidence, for the Church at Antioch is that in the third century it may have begun to penetrate to the non-Hellenized strata of the population.

These considerations must tend to call in question certain presuppositions from which the events of the 260's and 270's have been approached. That done, it is time to consider the course of these events themselves.

4. PALMYRA AND ANTIOCH

If we turn from the complex and elusive questions of the cultural background to the more immediate and concrete political setting, the primary question is chronological—when did Palmyrene control of Antioch begin?

The relevant events begin with the capture of Valerian in 259/60 by Shapur I, and the subsequent capture of Antioch.[87] After this campaign Shapur retired, attacked *en route* by Odenathus of Palmyra.[88] At the same time there came the proclamation as *Augusti* of Macrianus and Quietus by their father, Macrianus, and Ballista (Callistus).[89] All that is necessary to note in the present context is that their regime lasted at least until 261 (for instance, a recently-published papyrus is dated to 17 May in their second joint consulate and first Egyptian year, so 261).[90] Macrianus advanced into Europe and was defeated by Gallienus. Quietus was defeated by Odenathus. It is important to note that our admittedly scanty sources say that the victory took place at Emesa.[91] Was the Palmyrene presence on the upper Orontes at this moment followed by either a physical occupation or an effective overlordship of the cities of Roman Syria? Documentary evidence shows that by 258 Odenathus had the title ὑπατικός—but this does not (as has been claimed) serve to prove that he was governor of Syria-Phoenice.[92] In about 260 he is alleged (see below) to have received the title *corrector totius Orientis* from Gallienus, and almost certainly assumed rather than was given that of Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων. The available evidence on his movements and activities shows, however, nothing further concerned with the Roman province, but rather two invasions of Mesopotamia, reaching to Ctesiphon.[93] He is first heard of in Roman Syria again at the moment of his murder, again at Emesa,[94] which took place in

[85] Note, however, Theodoret's account of a fourth-century monastic foundation near Zeugma where the original group of Greek-speaking monks was soon followed by one of Aramaic-speakers, which was kept separate but had complete parity with the first, *Hist. Relig.* 5 (*PG* LXXXII, 1352–7).

[86] See Duval, op. cit. (n. 45), 5; Baumstark, op. cit. (n. 45), 58 f.; I. Ortiz di Urbina, *Patrologia Syriaca* (1958), ch. v.

[87] The date 259 rather than 260 is argued by S. Lopuszanski, *La date de la capture de Valérien et la chronologie des empereurs gaulois* (1951); cf. Th. Pekary, 'Bemerkungen zur Chronologie des Jahrzehnts 250–60 n. Chr.', *Historia* XI (1963), 123, and *PIR*² L 258.

[88] The evidence is late—Festus, *Brev.* 23; Jerome, *Chron.* ed. Helm, p. 221; *HA, Trig. Tyr.* 15, 1–4; *Vit. Val.* 4, 2–4; Malalas, *Chron.* p. 297, 4 Dindorf; Syncellus, p. 716 (Bonn); Zonaras XII, 23; J. Février, *Essai sur l'histoire politique et économique de Palmyre* (1931), 81–4; J. Starcky, *Palmyre* (1952), 53 f. The essential modern treatment of the chronology of Odenathus and Vabalathus and their successive titulatures is D. Schlumberger, 'L'inscription d'Hérodien: remarques sur l'histoire des princes de Palmyre', *Bull. d'ét. orient.* IX (1942–3), 35.

[89] For the best account see A. Alföldi, 'Die römische Münzprägung und die historischen Ereignisse im Osten zwischen 260 und 270 n. Chr.' *Berytus* V (1938), 47 = *Studien zur Geschichte der Weltkrise des 3. Jahrhunderts nach Christus* (1967), 155.

[90] *P. Oxy.* 2710.

[91] Zon. XII, 24; cf. *HA, Vit. Gall.* 3, 4, and Petrus Petricius, *FHG* IV, p. 195 = Dio, ed. Boissevain III, p. 744.

[92] *Contra* Schlumberger, op. cit. (n. 88), 48, and J. Starcky, op. cit. (n. 88), 54. The title appears in *IGR* III, 1031 = J. Cantineau, *Inventaire des inscriptions de Palmyre* III (1930), no. 17. Cf. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (1950), ch. XXIX, n. 32.

[93] See Février, op. cit. (n. 88), 85 f; Alföldi, op. cit. (n. 89), 76 f. (188 f.).

[94] Zosimus I, 39, 2. Note, however, the variant tradition of Syncellus I, p. 716–7 (Bonn), according to which he was killed in Cappadocia on his way to repel a Gothic invasion.

267/8.[95] During this period it is notable that the mint of Antioch continues to produce coins for Gallienus from 263 up to the moment of his death in 268, and for Claudius up to 269; the coinage provides no suggestion of the detachment of Syria from the Roman Empire up to this time.[96] Confirmation both of normal minting at Antioch up to 269 and of unsettled circumstances immediately after that, is provided by a hoard from near Bogazköy which includes 87 coins of Gallienus, and 427 of Claudius minted at Antioch.[97]

The same story is told by both the literary sources and the documentary evidence on titulature. Vabalathus began by assuming the titles, *corrector* (see below) and ' King of Kings '. In 270 he advanced to *consul, dux Romanorum* and *Imperator*, though acknowledging Aurelian as *Augustus*. His own proclamation as ' Augustus ' came after August, 271, when Zenobia appears without the title ' Augusta ' on an inscription from Palmyra.[98] The coinage of Antioch confirms that it did not come until the spring of 272, almost at the very moment of Aurelian's reconquest.[99]

The decisive break, however, and the Palmyrene occupation of Syria, had clearly happened before this. Exactly how soon, it is not easy to say. Zosimus portrays Aurelian, after the Danubian campaign of his first year (270),[100] reckoning with the Palmyrene occupation both of Egypt and of all Asia Minor up to Ankara.[101] Earlier, Zosimus places the invasion of Egypt under Claudius (268–70), and says that Syrian troops were used for it;[102] this squares with the evidence of Malalas (299, 4) that Zenobia took Arabia from the Romans under Claudius. The Egyptian evidence shows the invasion coming in the regime of the Prefect Probus in 269/70;[103] papyri and Alexandrian coins suggest that the actual capture of the city did not take place until the end of 270.[104] This agrees absolutely with the fact that the offerings the Palmyrenes made at the shrine of Aphrodite at Aphaca, between Baalbek and Byblos, were presented only a year before their final disaster in 272,[105] and that the inscription of Zenobia from near Byblos calls her ' Augusta ', and therefore seems to belong in the latest period, probably 272.[106]

From this evidence it is not inconceivable that the Palmyrene drive south-west, through Arabia to Egypt, came before the occupation of Northern Syria. It is possible that Antioch was not occupied until 270; none of our evidence firmly indicates any earlier date.[107] We must accept that Emesa was firmly within the Palmyrene sphere of control through the 260's; but the territory of Emesa bordered that of Palmyra itself, and the two cities had close cultural ties.[108] Have we any evidence to suggest the existence of a wider sphere of Palmyrene influence throughout this period ?

Firstly, we have the title which is alleged to have been held by Odenathus from about 260, and inherited by Vabalathus in 267/8, namely *corrector totius Orientis*.[109] If genuine,

[95] Probably between 29 August, 267 and 28 August, 268, because Alexandrian coins seem to show the fourth year of Vabalathus ending on 28 August, 271. See Schlumberger, op. cit. (n. 88), 61.

[96] See Alföldi, op. cit. (n. 89), and *CAH* XII, 178–9. Cf. C. Brenot and H.-G. Pflaum, ' Les émissions orientales de la fin du III^e^ siècle après J.-C. à la lumière de deux trésors découverts en Syrie,' *Rev. Num.* VII (1965), 134; cf. J.-P. Callu, *La politique monétaire des empereurs romains de 238 à 311*, Bib. Éc. Fr. Ath. Rom., CCXIV (1969), 220–1.

[97] K. Bittel, ' Funde im östlichen Galatien: ein römischer Münzschatz von Devret,' *Ist. Mitt.* VI (1955), 27.

[98] J. Cantineau, *Inventaire* III (1930), no. 20 = *OGIS* 648; see Starcky, op. cit. (n. 88), 58.

[99] See Schlumberger, op. cit. (n. 88), and H. Seyrig, ' Vabalathus Augustus ', *Mélanges Michalowski* (1966), 659. Note, however, an ostracon, *O. Mich.* 1006 which dates to May/June, 271 and describes Aurelian and Athenodorus (Vabalathus) as Αὐγυστῶν.

[100] Dated to 270 by A. Alföldi, ' Uber die Juthungeneinfälle unter Aurelian ', *BIAB* XVI (1950), 21 = *Studien*, 427. But see n. 164 below.

[101] Zos. I, 50, 1.

[102] Zos. I, 44. cf. *HA, Claud.* 11, 1–2. Compare the inscription published by H. Seyrig, *Syria* XXXI 1954), 214–17. Originating probably from the Hauran, it refers to the deaths of many persons in Egypt, probably men recruited by Palmyra.

[103] See A. Stein, *Die Präfekten von Ägypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (1950), 148–50.

[104] See P. J. Parsons, ' A Proclamation of Vaballathus? ', *Chron. d'Ég.* XLII (1967), 397. See also n. 164 below.

[105] Zos. I, 58.

[106] *OGIS* 647 = *IGR* III 1065. On the other hand, the milestone of Vabalathus on the Bostra-Philadelphia road (*AE* 1904, 60) calls him ' Im(perator) Caesar ' but not ' Augustus ', and will be a year or two earlier.

[107] Perhaps the nearest to concrete evidence available are the two *tesserae* of Herodianus and Zenobia which were *probably* found at Antioch, published by H. Seyrig, ' Note sur Hérodien, prince de Palmyre ', *Syria* XVIII (1937), 1. Herodianus should be the Herodes, son of Odenathus, who was killed with his father in 267/8 (*HA, Trig. Tyr.* 15–16). But even if the find-spots of the *tesserae* were certain, they are portable objects.

[108] See H. Seyrig, ' Caractères de l'histoire d'Émèse ', *Syria* XXXVI (1959), 184.

[109] See M. Clermont-Ganneau, ' Odeinat et Vaballat, rois de Palmyre, et leur titre romain de Corrector ', *RB* XXIX (1920), 382; Février, op. cit. (n. 93), 99; A. Stein, *Aegyptus* XVIII (1938), 234; Schlumberger, op. cit. (n. 88), 42, n. 8.

such an expression might indeed give some justification for the notion of an active Palmyrene patronage in Syrian cities. But nothing in our documentary evidence justifies the supposition of such a Latin title. The documents show that Odenathus had the title MTQNN' DY MDNH' KLH.[110] MTQNN' could be the equivalent of *Restitutor* just as well as of *Corrector*.[111] The strict equivalent of *Corrector* appears only in an inscription of Vabalathus,[112] where he is called 'PNRTT' DY MDYTH KLH, where 'PNRTT' is certainly a transcription of ἐπανορθωτής. The two expressions are not necessarily identical in meaning. In any case the expression which follows here—MDYTH—is the equivalent of 'πόλις' or 'provincia'. Even granted that KLH means 'every', we have still no indication of how wide was the geographical area concerned, still less any justification for assuming an equivalence and translating Odenathus' title as 'corrector totius Orientis'. On the contrary, Zosimus, in his detailed and circumstantial narrative, has an anecdote of the Palmyrenes, evidently during their apogee in 270–1, enquiring of Apollo at Seleucia 'whether they would obtain the domination of the East'.[113]

The literary sources provide no firmer basis for supposing any established Palmyrene hegemony over any of the Eastern Roman provinces. Zosimus and Zonaras state no more than that Gallienus gave Odenathus a major military role against Persia.[114] Eutropius and Orosius, for what they are worth on a precise point, imply that Zenobia's wider ambitions postdated the murder of her husband.[115] In fact the notion of a general rule of the East by Odenathus depends fundamentally on a number of grandiose generalizations in the *Historia Augusta* [116]—which also states, falsely, that Gallienus awarded him the title 'Augustus'.[117]

That Palmyra or its rulers exercised any real influence in Antioch before about 270 thus remains a pure speculation unsupported by any reliable concrete evidence. On the other hand, we do have the testimony of Zosimus to the fact that when Aurelian retook Antioch in 272 there was a pro-Palmyrene group there which was preparing to flee in terror until the Emperor issued an edict of amnesty;[118] and, on the other side, Jerome records the name of an apparently Antiochene *dux* who fought at the battle of Immae against Zenobia.[119] These statements certainly make it reasonable to ask whether the career of a controversial figure in Antioch at this time can be explained in terms of divided political loyalties. Whether this was so in the case of Paul must depend on a detailed examination of the evidence about him.

5. PAUL IN ANTIOCH

By far our most reliable and valuable evidence comes from Book VII of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, which gives substantial excerpts from the letter sent by the synod which deposed Paul, addressed to Dionysius, bishop of Rome and Maximus, bishop of Alexandria. It is noteworthy that both in his own remarks and in his choice of excerpts Eusebius concentrates (conveniently for our purposes) on the externals of Paul's conduct, and is almost entirely silent on the precise heresies as to the nature of Christ of which he was held guilty. For Paul's views—he affirmed the unity of God and the Word (using the term *homoousios*) and denied the divinity of Christ—we have to rely on late reports and quotations of the dialogue between himself and Malchion (see below) at his examination.[120]

[110] *Inventaire* III 19 (= *CIS* 3946).

[111] See J. Cantineau, 'Un *Restitutor Orientis* dans les inscriptions de Palmyre', *Journal Asiatique* CCXXII (1933), 217.

[112] See Clermont-Ganneau, op. cit. (n. 109), 394, 398.

[113] Zos. I, 57, 4, εἰ καθέξουσιν τὴν τῆς ἑῴας ἡγεμονίαν.

[114] Zos. I, 39, 1, τοῖς δὲ περὶ τὴν ἑῴαν πράγμασιν οὕσιν ἐν ἀπογνώσει βοηθεῖν Ὀδαίναθον ἔταξεν. Zon. XII, 24 Ὠδέναθον δὲ τῆς ἀνδραγαθίας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀμειβόμενος πάσης ἀνατολῆς αὐτὸν προχειρίσατο στρατηγόν. Cf. Syncellus, p. 716 (Bonn.) ὃς καὶ στρατηγὸς τῆς ἑῴας ὑπὸ Γαλιηνοῦ διὰ τοῦτο τετίμηται.

[115] Eutropius IX, 13, 2, 'Zenobiam quoque occiso Odenatho marito Orientem tenebat'; Orosius VII, 23, 4 'Zenobiam, quae occiso Odenato marito suo Syriam receptam sibi vindicabat'; cf. Festus, *Brev.* 24 'ea enim post mortem mariti feminea dicione Orientis tenebat imperium'.

[116] *HA*, *Vit. Gall.* 1, 1 'Cum Odenatus iam Orientis cepisset imperium'; 3, 3 'totius prope Orientis factus est Odenatus imperator'; 10, 1. 'Odenatus rex Palmyrenorum obtinuit totius Orientis imperium'; *Trig. Tyr.* 14, 1, 'Odenatus, qui olim iam orientem tenebat'.

[117] *HA*, *Vit. Gall.* 12, 1.

[118] Zos. I, 51, 3.

[119] Jer., *Chron.* ed. Helm, p. 222 'In qua pugna strenuissime adversum eam dimicavit Pompeianus dux cognomento Francus. Cuius familia hodieque aput Antiochiam perseverat. Ex cuius Euagrius presbyter carissimus nobis stirpe descendit.'

[120] See H. de Riedmatten, *Les Actes du procès de Paul de Samosate; étude sur la Christologie du IIIe au IVe siècle* (1952).

Eusebius' delicacy on this point can hardly be unrelated to the fact of his own involvement with Arianism;[121] that the historical connection between Paul's doctrines and Arianism has sometimes been denied by modern scholars is less relevant than the fact that it was vigorously asserted by a contemporary, Peter, bishop of Alexandria.[122]

The chronological framework is crucial to our understanding of the career. First, Eusebius (*HE* VII, 27, 1) records the election of Dionysius to succeed the martyred Xystus as bishop of Rome: Xystus was executed on August 6, 258,[123] and Dionysius was consecrated on July 22, 259 or 260.[124] In the next sentence Eusebius gives the death of the bishop Demetrianus at Antioch, and his succession by Paul; a later legend, too readily believed, relates that Demetrianus was in fact carried into captivity by Shapur.[125] Jerome's *Chronicle* places the election of Paul in 261.[126] Paul's heretical tendencies were evidently not long in showing themselves, for a synod convened to consider them some three or four years later. The approximate date can be confidently established: among the bishops invited was Dionysius of Alexandria, who excused himself on the grounds of age and feebleness, and wrote a letter exposing Paul's errors, but then (ἐν τούτῳ) died, in the twelfth year of Gallienus (263/4 or 264/5).[127] There is no reason to doubt that the synod took place in about 264. The upshot of the synod was a promise by Paul, not fulfilled, to abandon his errors.[128]

The date of the decisive synod is more difficult to establish. In *HE* VII, 28, 4 Eusebius records together the death of Gallienus (268), the reign of Claudius, and the accession of Aurelian (270). He then passes on, with the expression καθ' ὅν [sc. χρόνον] to the affair of Paul (VII, 29, 1). Various converging items of evidence combine, however, to suggest that the synod in fact took place over the winter of 268/9.[129] Jerome's *Chronicle*[130] places the deposition of Paul in the year before the 262nd Olympiad (269) and this date is reflected also in Zonaras, who makes the episode approximately contemporary with the death of Gallienus.[131] In his *Contestatio* against Nestorius at the Council of Constantinople in 428/9, Eusebius, the later bishop of Dorylaeum, referred to the excommunication of Paul 160 years before[132]—so, if taken precisely, 268/9. The letter of the synod itself contains two clues. It is addressed to Dionysius, Bishop of Rome, who died on 26 or 27 December 268.[133] It may be that the letter of the synod arrived after his death; for though the surviving letter of his successor, Felix, addressed to Maximus of Alexandria on precisely the point at issue, the divinity of Christ, is generally regarded as an Apollinarist forgery, it may have replaced a genuine original letter.[134] Secondly, the letter refers (30, 5) to the fact that Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, died at Tarsos on his way to Antioch, at a moment when the other participants had arrived and were waiting for him; according to the Greek calendar his death took place on 28 October.[135] The date of the synod can therefore be fixed with considerable precision and with no real room for doubt.

The central element in the view that connects the career of Paul with the wider political history of his time is a passage in Eusebius' quotation of the synodal letter.[136] The bishops state that Paul came from an impoverished family, but had made himself rich through extortion in his bishopric—ἐξ ἀνομιῶν καὶ ἱεροσυλιῶν καὶ ὧν αἰτεῖ καὶ σείει τοὺς ἀδελφούς . . . πορισμὸν ἡγούμενος τὴν θεοσέβειαν. Then comes the key phrase—ὑψηλὰ

[121] For a survey, D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (1960), ch. VI.

[122] See the letter of Alexander to his namesake, bishop of Constantinople, Theodoret, *HE* I, 4, 32–6.

[123] Cypr., *Ep.* 80, 1. cf. L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis* I (1955), 155.

[124] See Duchesne, op. cit. 157; C. H. Turner, 'The Papal Chronology of the Third Century', *J. Th. St.* XVII (1915/6), 338; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* I (1930), 71–2.

[125] The tale is given in the Arabic *Chronicle of Seert* (*Patr. Or.* IV, 222–1). See Bardy, op. cit. (n. 8), 241 f. and Downey, op. cit. (n. 9), 309, and now M. L. Chaumont, 'Les Sassanides et la christianisation de l'Empire iranien au III^e siècle de notre ère', *Rev. Hist. Rel.* CLXV (1964), 165. There is not the slightest reason to prefer such a source to the plain statement of Eusebius.

[126] Jerome, *Chron.* ed. Helm, 220.

[127] Euseb., *HE* VII, 27, 2; 28, 3 (cf. 30, 3). For the problem of Gallienus' regnal years, see E. Manni, 'Note di epigrafia gallieniana', *Epigraphica* IX (1947), 113.

[128] ibid. 30, 4.

[129] See Loofs, op. cit. (n. 10), 45 f.; Bardy, op. cit. (n. 8), 296–7.

[130] Ed. Helm, p. 221.

[131] Zon. XII, 25.

[132] See de Riedmatten, op. cit. (n. 120) 27, 136.

[133] See O. Bardenwehr, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* II (1914), 644–5; cf. C. H. Turner, op. cit. (n. 124), 348–9; L. Duchesne, op. cit. (n. 123), 157.

[134] See, e.g., A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* I (1893), 659–10; cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology* II (1953), 242.

[135] See Loofs, op. cit. (n. 10), 50; Bardy, op. cit. (n. 8), 297.

[136] *HE* VII, 30, 7–9.

φρονεῖ καὶ ὑπερῆρται, κοσμικὰ ἀξιώματα ὑποδυόμενος καὶ δουκηνάριος μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπίσκοπος θέλων καλεῖσθαι. The letter continues by describing the public role to which these aspirations led him—parading across the agoras, reading letters and answering them as he went, with a numerous bodyguard, some marching in front and some behind, so that his pomp and pride made the faith an object of envy and hatred; in meetings of the church (ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς συνόδοις) he devised various means to impress the simple-minded—βῆμα μὲν καὶ θρόνον ὑψηλὸν ἑαυτῷ κατεσκευασάμενος . . . σήκρητόν τε, ὥσπερ οἱ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχοντες ἔχων τε καὶ ὀνομάζων.

The term *ducenarius* was a well-established expression, deriving from the level of salary, for a high-ranking Imperial *procurator*.[137] We find it used in a letter of Cyprian and his fellow bishops to the congregation of Emerita—'actis etiam publice habitis apud procuratorem ducenarium'.[138] As used in Antioch, it could in normal times only have referred to the *procurator* of the province of Syria Coele.[139] Like the parallel term *centenarius*,[140] however, it is also attested in use at Palmyra, being one of the many titles of a prominent Palmyrene, Septimius Vorodes.[141] Moreover, but for a crucial textual difficulty, there would be confirmation from Cyprian for the notion that bishops might combine with their office the holding of an Imperial procuratorship. In *de lapsis* 6, Cyprian writes:

> episcopi . . . divina procuratione contempta procuratores regum (*sic* SW; rerum, R) saecularium fieri, derelicta cathedra, plebe deserta per alienas provincias oberrantes negotiationis quaestuosae nundinas aucupari, esurientibus in ecclesia fratribus habere argentum largiter velle, fundos insidiosis fraudibus rapere, usuris multiplicationibus faenus augere.

The logic of the passage seems to demand the reading 'rerum'; there is nothing else in it which refers in any way to the Emperors, and the other activities of the delinquent bishops seem to represent entirely private profiteering. This evidence can therefore not be adduced in support.

Moreover, whatever interpretation is given to the crucial passage of the synodal letter, one thing is clear, namely that it contains no reference to Palmyra or its rulers. This may now seem hardly surprising for, as we have seen (pp. 9–10 above), it was written before the period from which we have any evidence of a Palmyrene military presence in Antioch, and in a period when no other evidence proves a general Palmyrene patronage of the Syrian cities. None the less, the connection with Palmyra, missing in the letter, is duly supplied by later Christian sources. Tabulated in chronological order they are as follows:[142]

(1) Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum* 71, 1 Ἰουδαία ἦν Ζηνοβία καὶ Παύλου προέστη τοῦ Σαμοσατέως (*c.* 358). (Cf. also the fragment, possibly of Athanasius, in *PG* XXVI, 1293.)

(2) Filastrius, *Diversarum haereseon liber* 36/64 (*CSEL* XXXVIII, p. 33; *CCL* IX, p. 244). 'Hic Christum hominem iustum, non deum verum praedicebat . . . unde et Zenobiam quandam reginam in oriente tunc temporis ipse docuit iudaeizare.' (385–91).

(3) John Chrysostom, *Hom.* 8 *in Joannem* (*PG* LIX, col. 66) οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀγνοῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σφόδρα εἰδὼς ἡμάρτανε, ταὐτὸν παθὼν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. καθάπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ὁρῶντες, τὸ τῆς πίστεως προῦδωκαν ὑγιές, εἰδότες μὲν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἄρχοντας οὐχ ὁμολογοῦντες, ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται· οὕτω καὶ τοῦτον (*sc.* Paul) γυναικί τινι χαριζόμενον, τὴν σωτηρίαν φασὶν ἀποδόσθαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ (391).

(4) Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* II, 8 (*PG* LXXXIII, col. 393) Ζηνοβίας δὲ κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν τοπαρχούσης (Πέρσαι γὰρ Ῥωμαίους νενικηκότες ταύτῃ παρέδοσαν τὴν τῆς Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης ἡγεμονίαν), εἰς τὴν Ἀρτέμωνος ἐξώκειλεν αἵρεσιν, ταύτῃ νομίζων θεραπεύειν ἐκείνην τὰ Ἰουδαίων φρονοῦσαν (*c.* 453).

All of these passages bring in, in one form or another, a tendentious reference to Judaism. This is not surprising, for there was a clear resemblance between Jewish belief

[137] See H.-G. Pflaum, *Les procurateurs équestres* (1950), 210 f.; idem, *Les carrières procuratoriennes* (1960–1), 950–1; cf. *JRS* LIII (1963), 197–8.

[138] Cypr., *Ep.* 67, 6.

[139] Pflaum, *Carrières* 1082.

[140] See Schlumberger, op. cit. (n. 88), 35–8.

[141] *OGIS* 645 = *IGR* III, 1043; *OGIS* 646 = *IGR* III, 1045; *IGR* III, 1044; cf. H. Ingholt, 'Inscriptions and sculptures from Palmyra', *Berytus* III (1936), pp. 93–5.

[142] cf. Loofs, op. cit. (n. 10), 18; Bardy, op. cit. (n. 8), 81 f.

and Paul's teaching—and Epiphanius in the *Panarion* (while making no reference to Zenobia) says that the *Paulianistae* differ from the Jews only in not observing the Sabbath or circumcision.[143] On the other hand there is a separate account, apparently not related to the tradition about Paul, of the Judaising tendencies of Zenobia. This appears in some remarks made about Longinus by Photius[144]—ἦν καὶ μεταβαλεῖν εἰς τὰ Ἰουδαίων ἔθη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δεισιδαιμονίας παλαιὸς ἀναγράφει λόγος. Even of this there is very little confirmatory evidence: the Talmud has one anecdote of an appeal by Jewish elders to Zenobia, but the attitude expressed there is otherwise hostile.[145] On the other hand an inscription from Egypt does show a *regina* and *rex*, evidently Zenobia and Vabalathus, confirming a Ptolemaic grant of right of asylum to a synagogue.[146]

The most extreme version of the story, though the earliest attested, that Zenobia was herself Jewish, can be firmly discounted. It is true that we find an indubitably Jewish Zenobius on a Palmyrene inscription of A.D. 212.[147] But the name is common in Palmyra, and a more probable candidate for relationship to Zenobia would be the Iulius Aurelius Zenobius whom we find exercising important functions during the visit of Severus Alexander in 231.[148] Jewish sources show no awareness that Zenobia was Jewish, and the possibility is of course incompatible with the much better attested claim that she had leanings towards Judaism. This in its turn, though it has little positive support (see above) is not impossible. There is fairly substantial evidence for a Jewish community in Palmyra.[149] Her possible favour to Judaism combined with the nature of Paul's doctrines *may* explain how the story of their connection arose. But we can also discount the version of Theodoret and Chrysostom, that the desire to please Zenobia was the *cause* of Paul's lapse into heresy. Paul was already accused of heresy in about 264, Zenobia only became prominent (so far as we know) after the death of her husband in 267/8, and the Palmyrenes perhaps entered Antioch only in 270. At the most then, her patronage of Paul may have begun in the period after the synod, when Paul clung on obstinately in the church house.[150] We cannot actually disprove the third version of the story, that of Filastrius, that Paul influenced Zenobia in the direction of Judaism.

What then of Paul's procuratorship ? A closer look will show it to be a fantasy. The whole sense of the passage in the synodal letter is that Paul as bishop modelled his style and public appearances after those of Imperial officials—' *wishing to be called ducenarius* rather than bishop ', ' *arranging for himself* a tribunal and high throne ' (probably modelled on a governor's tribunal and seat, though even normal bishops had something of the sort [151]), ' having a *secretum*, and *calling it that*, like wordly rulers ' (the reference must be to what is normally called the *secretarium* of a governor, the audience-chamber where a number of attested trials of martyrs took place [152]). Everything that is said of the improper activities of Paul relates to the life of the Christian congregation—extorting money from *the brethren*, making the *service of God* a source of profit, organizing spectacles *in the assemblies of the church*, insulting those who received his words without excessive enthusiasm *as was fitting in a house of God*. The worthy bishops would have been surprised to know how long and undeserved a life their words have given to ' Paul of Samosata, the *ducenarius* of Zenobia '.

[143] Epiphanius, *Panarion* 65, 2, 5.

[144] Photius, *Bib.* 265, ed. Bekker, p. 492 (see n. 56 above).

[145] Jerusalem Talmud, *Terumoth* 8, 12 (trans. Schwab. III, 107). See J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* II: *the Early Sasanian Period* (1966), 51.

[146] *OGIS* 129 = *ILS* 574 = *Corp. Ins. Jud.* 1449 = E. Gabba, *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia* (1958), no. 8.

[147] Frey, *Corp. Ins. Jud.* no. 820.

[148] *OGIS* 640 = *IGR* III 1033; cf. *PIR*^{2} I 196. It is not a fatal objection to this possibility that Zenobia is found with the *nomen* ' Septimia ', for this is not attested for Palmyrenes, other than the family of Odenathus, until the 260's; see Schlumberger, *Bull. d'Ét. Or.* IX (1942/3), 59.

[149] See E. Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ (1926), 24–5; Frey, *Corp. Ins. Jud.* II, pp. 65–73.

[150] So, in effect, Loofs, op. cit. (n. 10), 34.

[151] Both θρόνος and βῆμα are attested for both civil and ecclesiastical authorities, see E. Stommel, ' Bischofsstuhl und Hoher Thron ', *Jahrb. f. Ant. u. Chr.* I (1958), 52; and note that very similar *podia* are found at Dura in the Christian building and in the palace of the *Dux*; see C. H. Kraeling, *The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report* VIII, 2 : *the Christian Building* (1967), 142–5. But note L. Robert, *Hellenica* IV (1948), 42–3, on the theme of the governor's βῆμα or θρόνος in Greek epigrams.

[152] Note the trial of the Scillitan martyrs, ' Kartagine in secretario '; of Crispina ' apud coloniam Thebestinam in secretario pro tribunali adsidente Anulino proconsule '; of Cyprian, ' Carthagine in secretario ', Knopf-Krüger-Ruhbach, *Ausgewählte Martyrakten*^{4} (1965), 28, 62, 109. Cf. *RE* s.v. ' secretarium '.

6. THE APPEAL TO AURELIAN

The political history of his time will therefore explain neither the rise of Paul of Samosata nor his formal deposition. Whether it helps to explain his refusal to leave the church house, and his opponents' successful appeal to Aurelian, it is more difficult to say. At first sight it seems an obvious supposition that he clung on until Aurelian entered Antioch in 272, whereupon the loyalist party petitioned the Emperor and had him ejected; as was mentioned above (p. 10), we even know that there were then Palmyrene supporters in the city, whose fears Aurelian had to still, and also loyalists who aided the Roman forces.

But it must be noted that there are three separate problems here. The first concerns the motivation of the appeal to the Emperor; almost all that has been written about this episode has assumed almost unconsciously that only exceptional circumstances—or more precisely an immediate political situation such as that imagined here—would serve to explain how such an appeal could have been made. Secondly, there is the question of chronology; how and when did the appeal reach Aurelian, who assumed power probably in the summer of 270 and did not reach Antioch until 272? Thirdly, there is the favourable response by Aurelian, and the remarkable terms in which it was expressed. The first thing is to set out the brief couple of sentences of Eusebius (VII, 30, 19) which are our sole evidence for these proceedings. After concluding his extracts from the synodal letter, and mentioning the deposition of Paul and the election in his place of Domnus, Eusebius continues:

> ἀλλὰ γὰρ μηδαμῶς ἐκστῆναι τοῦ Παύλου τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οἴκου θέλοντος, βασιλεὺς ἐντευχθεὶς Αὐρηλιανὸς αἰσιώτατα περὶ τοῦ πρακτέου διείληφεν, τούτοις νεῖμαι προστάττων τὸν οἶκον, οἷς ἂν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐπίσκοποι τοῦ δόγματος ἐπιστέλλοιεν. οὕτω δῆτα ὁ προδηλωθεὶς ἀνὴρ μετὰ τῆς ἐσχάτης αἰσχύνης ὑπὸ τῆς κοσμικῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξελαύνεται τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

Even the most immediate character of the situation is not easy to grasp. What was 'the house of the church'? We can suppose that it bore some resemblance to the private house at Dura-Europos, converted for use in Christian services.[153] Moreover, there is no doubt that by the end of the third century Christian communities generally possessed a regular meeting-place, variously called οἶκος ἐκκλησίας, κυριακόν or προσευκτηρίον. There does not appear, however, to be good evidence from this period that it was ever combined with an actual episcopal residence.[154] One must suppose rather that Paul continued to perform services there, perhaps with the support of a part of the congregation.

Hence the appeal to the Emperor. It is crucial to our understanding of both the Roman Empire, and of the place of the Church within it, to realize that we do not *have* to find exceptional political circumstances to explain recourse to the Emperor as arbiter. For an immense mass of evidence shows us that individuals and communities saw the giving of justice as a primary function of the Emperor, just as they had of the Hellenistic monarchs who preceded them.[155] Even if we confine ourselves to Syrian evidence alone, we may note, first, the inscription which contains a series of appeals to rulers from the temple-community of Baetocaece, stretching from probably the third century B.C. to A.D. 258/9.[156] Then we have the words of an orator addressing Caracalla in Antioch in May 27, 216, on the subject of the priesthood of the temple at Dmeir:[157]

[153] See C. H. Kraeling, op. cit. (n. 151); esp. p. 127 f., 'The Christian Building at Dura and Early Church Architecture'; cf. R. Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (1965), ch. I. Compare R. L. P. Milburn, 'Ὁ ΤΗΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ ΟΙΚΟΣ,' *J. Th. St.* XLVI (1945), 65, and Chr. Mohrmann, 'Les dénominations de l'église en tant qu'édifice en grec et en latin au cours des premiers siècles chrétiens', *Rev. Sci. Rél.* XXXVI (1962), Supp. 155, esp. 158–9.

[154] Though for instance Lebreton and Zeiller, op. cit. (n. 12), 349, use the term 'maison épiscopale'. Kraeling, op. cit. (n. 151), 128 and 134 does not seem to me to offer concrete evidence for the residence of presbyters in *domus ecclesiae*.

[155] See F. Millar, 'The Emperor, the Senate and the Provinces', *JRS* LVI (1966), 156; 'Emperors at Work', *JRS* LVII (1967), 9; *The Roman Empire and its Neighbours* (1967), 42–3, 75–80.

[156] *OGIS* 262 = Abbott and Johnson, *Municipal Administration* no. 147; cf. F. Millar, *CR* N.S. XVIII (1968), 264, which requires correction in the light of H. Seyrig, 'Aradus et Baetocaecé,' *Syria* XXVIII (1951), 191. The document is now re-edited as *IGLS* 4028.

[157] P. Roussel, F. de Visscher, 'Les inscriptions du temple de Dmeir', *Syria* XXIII (1942/3), 173; W. Kunkel 'Der Prozess der Gohariener vor Caracalla', *Festschrift H. Lewald* (1953), 81; *SEG* XVII 759. On the lines in question (38–43) see now N. Lewis, 'Cognitio Caracallae de Goharienis: Two Textual Restorations', *TAPA* XCIX (1968), 255.

'There is a famous temple of Zeus among them, famous indeed among all the people of the area . . . they frequent it and conduct processions to it. The first wrong done by our adversary . . . he benefits from freedom from [taxation and ?] liturgies, wears a gold crown, [enjoys *proedria*?], wields a sceptre and has proclaimed himself priest of Zeus. How he gained such a privilege I shall show.'

The close resemblance to what will have been said to Aurelian about Paul of Samosata needs no stressing. It does not follow of itself that a Christian community could have come easily to make such a claim before a pagan Emperor. But the groundwork for such an advance had in fact long been prepared. For just about a century before the case of Paul arose, we find Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, discussing the Christian view of the Emperor.[158] Why do the Christians not worship the Emperor? Because he is not a god, but a man, appointed by God, not to receive homage, but to give judgment rightly—θεὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπος, ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμένος, οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ δικαίως κρίνειν.

It must be remembered that Gallienus' edict of toleration was by now about a decade old. There was on the face of it nothing to stop the increasingly settled and well-established church from taking its place with other institutions in the life of the Empire. The moral had indeed been drawn immediately after the Edict. For Eusebius reproduces a rescript (ἀντιγράφη) of Gallienus, written in answer to a request from the bishops of Egypt for recovery of church property there; in the same paragraph he mentions what was evidently another rescript to a different group of local bishops concerning the recovery of Christian cemeteries.[159]

It was therefore only a relatively small further step that the congregation of Antioch should address themselves to the Emperor for help in recovering their church house from an impudent heretic. To do so they did not necessarily have to wait until the Emperor was in the locality. We have no reason to think that Gallienus ever visited Egypt, and the likelihood is that the Eygptian churches—like innumerable associations or cities before them—sent a delegation to him.

What then was the sequence of events leading to the deposition of Paul? Nothing in the admittedly extremely brief narrative of Eusebius prepares us for the possibility that a period of three-and-a-half years passed, with Paul in illegal possession of the church house, until Aurelian arrived in person in Antioch. Moreover, Eusebius mentions the succession of Timaeus to Domnus, Paul's successor, as bishop of Antioch, quite separately from the affair of Paul—and Jerome puts Timaeus' consecration precisely n 272, and before the reconquest by Aurelian, which he puts in 273.[160] So it is equally possible that after the conclusion of the synod—whose letter was written, at the latest, before news of the death of Dionysius of Rome in December, 268 had arrived, and possibly as early as November of that year (see p. 11 above)—the Antiochene congregation responded more urgently to Paul's obduracy, and, perhaps some time in 269, despatched a delegation to the Emperor.

The evidence of the early Constantinian period suggests that it normally took several months from the issuing of an Imperial reply to its arrival in a provincial city.[161] Similarly, though here our information is less precise, it will have taken a comparable period for a delegation to reach the Emperor wherever he happened to be, to gain an audience and receive an answer.[162] These were, it hardly needs to be said, troubled times. Claudius was mainly engaged in combating barbarian invasions in central and Eastern Europe up to the moment of his death at Sirmium, which certainly took place later than 10 December 269,[163]

[158] Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* I, 11.

[159] *HE* VII, 13.

[160] *HE* VII, 32, 2; Jerome, *Chron.* ed. Helm. p. 222.

[161] *Cod. Just.* I, 21, 2; III, 24, 1; VII, 62, 12; IX, 40, 2; XII, 61, 1. For reasons which remain obscure, all these rescripts, to which the dates of *propositio* at the *comitatus* and acceptance by the city concerned are attached, date from the decade 310–20.

[162] Though where our sources give some indication of the time spent on embassies it tends to be in exceptional cases. But note, e.g., Jos., *Ant. J.* XVIII, 6, 5 (170–1)—deliberate delay by Tiberius; Philo. *Leg.* 29/185—Jewish Alexandrian embassy waiting for an audience with Gaius; Pliny, *Pan.* 79, 6–7.

[163] Claudius' third *trib. pot.* is clearly attested, *CIL* II 1672; III 3521 = *ILS* 570. See L. Bivona, 'Per la cronologia di Aureliano', *Epigraphica* XXVIII (1966), 106; as Bivona points out (p. 121), this essential datum is missing from J. Lafaurie ,'La chronologie impériale de 249 à 285', *Bull. Soc. Nat. Ant. France* 1965, 139; for the evidence on Claudius' activities see P. Damerau, *Kaiser Claudius II Goticus, Klio*, Beih. XXXIII, N.F. 20 (1934).

and seems now not to have been until summer, 270.[164] It would not be in the least surprising if, for one reason or another, no Imperial reply was forthcoming until given by Aurelian; the occasion could have been any moment from the very beginning of his reign onwards.

Even if, therefore, we suppose that the reply was not given in the context of the reconquest of 272, would it not still have been influenced by political considerations? It is certainly very difficult, but not absolutely impossible (see p. 9 above), to argue that it could have been given by Aurelian in ignorance of the Palmyrene occupation of Syria. None the less it is notable that the indication given by Eusebius of its terms contains no reference to Palmyra. It is possible to *interpret* the description of the orthodox party—'those with whom the bishops of Rome and Italy were in communication'—as a veiled reference to their loyalty to Rome. But it cannot be emphasized too strongly that, *as it stands*, the definition is strictly ecclesiastical. How then did Aurelian arrive at this remarkable formulation? Two hypotheses, not incompatible, are possible. The first is that it is quite evident from a number of examples of Imperial letters that Emperors in formulating a response very often took the passive course of following closely the wording of the request presented to them.[165] Thus Aurelian may well have taken over a description which the orthodox party gave to themselves. The second is that, whether or not the delegation was finally heard in Italy, or Rome itself, it may have been actively supported by bishops from there. For what it is worth, Zosimus, our only more or less coherent narrative source, shows Aurelian setting out from Rome at the beginning of his reign, going to Aquileia, then to Pannonia, and subsequently returning to Italy.[166] The delegation from Antioch could well have obtained a hearing somewhere in Italy before or after these campaigns.

All this, however, remains a hypothesis. Aurelian's decision *may* well not have come until 272, and in either case the formulation of it *may* have related to divisions in the Antiochene church which themselves reflected political allegiance to Rome or to Palmyra. All that can be asserted is that, if we set what we are actually told by someone relatively close to the event against the wider background of what we know of the nature of the Roman Empire, then we do not need an explanation in terms of contemporary politics for either the appeal to Aurelian or his reply. The relevance of these considerations to the early contacts of the Church and Constantine need not be stressed.

7. PAUL'S HERESY AND LOCAL CULTURE?

As so often, the effect of examining and dismissing large-scale assumptions which have been too hastily accepted is only to replace them with more precise doubts and questions. For all that is argued above, can we really be sure that the story of Paul does not reveal the suppression of a strain of local belief and liturgical practice by the prevailing orthodoxy of the Greek church? We must note, for instance, that among his opponents were men of established reputation in contemporary pagan Greek culture. His principal Antiochene opponent, the presbyter Malchion, was a learned man who was (apparently) the chief teacher of rhetoric at Antioch;[167] while among those who came to Antioch to examine his case was Anatolius from Alexandria, a student of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, physics and rhetoric, who was successively head of the Aristotelian school at Alexandria and bishop of Laodicea.[168]

On the other side, the resemblance between Paul's view of Christ and Jewish belief,

[164] The date of Aurelian's accession is still obscure. But Dr. J. Rea has kindly allowed me to see the arguments for a solution of the dating problem of Aurelian's reign which will be advanced in a forthcoming volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. The scheme which emerges is as follows: (1) Claudius survived until shortly before the end of his second Egyptian regnal year (269/70), (2) Quintillus is attested on Alexandrian coins but no known papyri are dated by him, (3) the third year of Claudius is attested on coins and papyri, suggesting that the news of his death had not yet spread. 270/1 is therefore Quintillus 1 (coins), Claudius 3 and also (from December) Aurelian 1/Vabalathus 4. (4) Subsequently Aurelian re-numbered his Egyptian regnal years to date from the death of Claudius, so making 269/70 Aurelian 1. (5) Egypt seems to have been recovered in the summer of 272.

[165] The parallel case of the repetition by the Emperor of the wording of the original letter when replying to a provincial governor is patent in the case of Pliny and Trajan, see Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* (1966), 537 f.; for letters in reply to city embassies see Millar, *Roman Empire* 76.

[166] Zos. 1, 48–9; see Alföldi, op. cit. (n. 100).

[167] If that is what is meant by the puzzling phrase of Eusebius, *HE* VII, 29, 2, σοφιστοῦ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας Ἑλληνικῶν παιδευτηρίων διατριβῆς προεστώς. Note M. Richard, 'Malchion et Paul de Samosate: le témoignage d'Eusèbe de Césarée', *Eph. Theol. Lovanienses* XXXV (1959), 325.

[168] *HE* VII, 32, 6, 21.

was (as noted above, p. 13) unmistakable. We cannot *prove* that Paul was not influenced by members of the substantial Jewish community in Antioch;[169] the example of Origen at Caesarea shows that learned discussions between Jews and Christians were still possible.[170] It may be noted that two Antiochene Christians of the generation after Paul, the presbyter Dorotheus,[171] and the important theologian and Biblical scholar, Lucian of Antioch,[172] are both attested as having had a profound knowledge of Hebrew. But whatever was said in later Christian literature about the Judaising tendencies of Paul or his followers, this particular line of attack was not used, so far as we know, by his contemporaries. On the contrary, they clearly regarded his heresy as a revival of that of Artemon (or Artemas);[173] of the latter nothing is known, though a phrase in the synodal letter appears to imply that he was still alive. What is clear is that the Adoptianist heresy here referred to is (rather obscurely) described by Eusebius as having originated in Rome in the late second century under the impulse of one Theodotus of Byzantium.[174] If there is a 'local' element in the nature of Paul's heresy it is rather, perhaps, to be found in its resemblance to that of Beryllus of Bostra, who thought that Christ did not pre-exist his birth, and had no divinity except that of the Father dwelling in him—and was duly corrected by an assembly of bishops, assisted by Origen, in about 238–44.[175]

Some claims for a local origin can be advanced for some of the innovations of Paul in liturgy and church practice. The synodal letter speaks of τὰς δὲ συνεισάκτους αὐτοῦ γυναῖκας, ὡς Ἀντιοχεῖς ὀνομάζουσιν:[176] the reference is to *virgines subintroductae*, that is (in theory) women living with priests without sexual relations. It is sometimes suggested that this was a distinctively Syrian form of asceticism.[177] But the practice, with its associated scandals, is clearly attested a few years earlier in Africa.[178] Paul also had a chorus of women who sang psalms specially composed in honour of himself—and were alleged to proclaim that he was in fact an angel who had descended from heaven.[179] Here one can only note, for lack of detail in the account of Paul, that other evidence indicates a particularly rich tradition of hymn-composition in Syriac, beginning with Bardesanes and his son Harmonius (see above, p. 3), and the hymns incorporated in the *Acts of Thomas*.[180] It is at least a reasonable speculation that Paul's compositions were related to this tradition.

These indications of specifically Syrian deviations in the belief and practice of Paul of Samosata are no more than hints (though often claimed as something more definite than that).[181] But they may serve to remind us of just how little we really understand. We can define some of the elements in the endlessly complex culture of the Fertile Crescent in the Roman period, and accept the impossibility of making simple deductions from culture to political attitudes; we can confidently dismiss from the history books the monstrous figure of 'Paul of Samosata, the *ducenarius* of Zenobia'; we can see that we do not necessarily need to look to the expansion of Palmyrene power in order to explain why the orthodox party in Antioch could appeal to a pagan Emperor. But we still are a long way from understanding the nature of the wider Aramaic-Greek culture of Syria and Mesopotamia, and how it affected the attitudes and beliefs of those who grew up in it.

The Queen's College, Oxford

[169] See C. H. Kraeling, 'The Jewish Community at Antioch', *Journ. Bib. Lit.* LI (1932), 130.

[170] See, e.g., M. Simon, *Verus Israel* [2] (1964), 235; H. Chadwick, *Origen : Contra Celsum* (1953), 41.

[171] Euseb., *HE* VII, 32, 2–4.

[172] Suda s.v. Λουκιανός. See G. Bardy, *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école* (1936), 43 f. 164 f.

[173] *HE* VII, 30, 16–17 (two extracts from the synodal letter); cf. Pamphilus, *Apologia pro Origene* 5 (*PG* XVII, 578–9); Theodoret, *Haer. fab. comp.* II, 4 (*PG* LXXXIII, 389).

[174] *HE* V, 28.

[175] *HE* VI, 33; the connection is indicated by J. Daniélou and H. Marrou, op. cit. (n. 12), 253. For the documentary record of the confutation by Origen of another local heresy, almost certainly Arabian also, see J. Scherer, *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide* (1960).

[176] *HE* VII, 30, 12.

[177] See A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient* I (1958), 79.

[178] See Cypr., *Ep.* 4.

[179] *HE* VII, 30, 10–11.

[180] See I.-M. Dalmais, 'L'apport des églises syriennes à l'hymnographie chrétienne', *Orient Syrien* II (1957), 243. Note the significant generalization (made without reference to Paul), p. 247 'la grande Église doit s'être toujours défiée des chants aussi capiteux, trop éloignées de cette 'sobre ivresse' et de cette réserve qui furent toujours siennes . . . Au cours du III[e] siècle une nette réaction se fait sentir en faveur de l'emploi exclusif des psaumes et des cantiques scriptuaires . . .'

[181] See J. Daniélou and H. Marrou, op. cit. (n. 12), 252, 'Il est typiquement oriental. On trouve chez lui les usages de la Syrie de l'est...'